

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

HENRY CLIFFORD BYRD, SR.,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
v.)	1:18CV332-1
)	
DAVIS MILLIS,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

ORDER

This matter is before this court for review of the Recommendation filed on August 30, 2019, by the Magistrate Judge in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). (Doc. 31.) In the Recommendation, the Magistrate Judge recommends that Respondent's Motion for Summary Judgment, (Doc. 17), be granted, that Petitioner's Motion for Summary Judgment, (Doc. 24), be denied, that Petitioner's Petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 for Writ of Habeas Corpus by a Person in State Custody, (Doc. 1), be denied, and that this action be dismissed. The Recommendation was served on the parties to this action on August 30, 2019. (Doc. 32.) Petitioner timely filed objections, (Doc. 34), to the Recommendation.

This court is required to "make a de novo determination of those portions of the [Magistrate Judge's] report or specified

proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). This court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the [M]agistrate [J]udge. . . . [O]r recommit the matter to the [M]agistrate [J]udge with instructions." Id.

This court has appropriately reviewed the portions of the Recommendation to which objections were made and has made a de novo determination which is in accord with the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation. This court therefore adopts the Recommendation.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation, (Doc. 31), is **ADOPTED**. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Respondent's Motion for Summary Judgment, (Doc. 17), is **GRANTED**, that Petitioner's Motion for Summary Judgment, (Doc. 24), is **DENIED**, that Petitioner's Petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 for Writ of Habeas Corpus by a Person in State Custody, (Doc. 1), is **DENIED**, and that this action is **DISMISSED**.

A Judgment dismissing this action will be entered contemporaneously with this Order. Finding no substantial issue for appeal concerning the denial of a constitutional right affecting the conviction, nor a debatable procedural ruling, a certificate of appealability is not issued.

This the 26th day of September, 2019.

William L. Ostun, Jr.
United States District Judge